



GENOA IS EVERYWHERE



Anarchist analyses of the G8 protests in Genoa with
reflections on true and false opposition
to global capitalism

by some Italian anarchists

Venomous Butterfly Publications

Venomous Butterfly Publications
818 SW 3rd Avenue, PMB 1237
Portland, OR 97204
USA

Anti-copyright

Every text, every picture, every sound that you like is yours. Take it and use it as yours without asking permission.

Against state vengeance and in spite of those who make use of the odious division into *good* and *bad*, already realized in the streets, before the judges (maybe justifying the conflicts with the cops as a legitimate response to the charges, but condemning actions against the structures of the state and capital that happened earlier...), it is the meaning of that uprising that we must affirm, against pacifiers and investigators. Because revolt explodes, well beyond the dates set by power, in the place where the game is really played: in the totality of our lives. This is where we will encounter, together with the social conflicts to come, the desires of those who fought with courage in Genoa. The place of a crime called freedom in which innocent and guilty do not exist.

So then no court, isolating and attacking the accused, will place its seal on those days.

CONTENTS

Translator's Introduction.....	2
Genoa Is Everywhere.....	4
Contributions Toward the Resumption of Hostilities.....	9
Tute Bianche: Firefighters Extinguishing Revolt.....	14
Some of Our Reflections on the Days in Genoa.....	17
A Contribution to the Information.....	21
To Have Done With the Order of the Many.....	24
The End of Illusions.....	28
Notes on Genoa from Adesso #8.....	30
Vultures.....	33
1+1=2: On the G8, Arrests and Solidarity.....	37
June 30, 1960, July 20, 2001...And Today.....	39
Making That July Turn Out to Be a Threat.....	42

TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

Just as the events of Seattle surprised everyone in 1999, those of Genoa in July 2001 also caught most people off guard. It was not only the brutality of the forces of order that surprised people, but also the well-aimed ferocity of some of the resistance. From the beginning of those days, distinctions began to be made between the "good" and the "bad" protesters, a distinction that always plays into the hands of those in power. The media, the authorities and the loyal opposition began to circulate stories to discredit every action that expressed open revolt against the totality of the state and capital, every action that got beyond the control of the leftist organizers of the event, the Genoa Social Forum and its allies.

The spread of such tales was necessary, because what happened in Genoa at that time was a real flare-up of the social war. If the sanctioned marches and actions tended to be the place for those who specialized in anti-globalization activism, the wandering acts of revolt that spread throughout Genoa attracted hundreds of individuals from the neighborhoods where the exploited live. And this is what the rulers and their loyal opposition needed to conceal. So to cover up what really went on, they wrote a script with the following players: the police and *carabinieri*¹; the Genoa Social Forum, the *Tute Bionche*², the *Rifondazione* Communist Party and the COBAS³; and the black bloc, the anarchists, the "insurrectionists", the infiltrators and the *agents provocateurs*.

The basic outline of this script is that those who followed the rules laid down by the organizers of the counter-summit were *good* protesters victimized by police forces run amok. These rules called for nonviolence, for demonstrating only in designated areas, for arranged confrontations with the forces of order and for the usual symbolic acts of civil "disobedience". Every action that did not abide by these rules was blamed on a supposedly small group of *bad* protesters. Depending on the story one read, these were members of the Black Bloc, anarchists, "insurrectionists" or fascists

¹ A national police force trained as a part of the military.

² "White Overalls", named for the costumes they wore at demonstrators, collaborators with the institutions of power and particularly the Rifondazione Communist Party, dissolved after Genoa and reconstituted as the *Disobbedienti*.

³ The base unions, grass roots workers' organizations that play.

Giuliani. A whitish puff that appeared suddenly above his head a moment before his death would show it. It is really true that in an image, everyone can see what they want. And in a competition of images and chatter between alternative and institutional media, it is useless to hide that the latter will always win.

Just as there is no use waiting for any truth from an image, in the same way we cannot expect any justice from a verdict. Because the courts are institutions of the same state that ordered the bloodbath that happened in Genoa. Why should judges ever condemn men who are habitually at their service? Let's get rid of the pious and reassuring commonplace that claims that a difference exists between the state of law and the state of deed, as if there were two entities that must be brought together in order to have justice. The state invents its law and applies and modifies this law as it believes best, knowing that it is just a question of wastepaper. The torturers who ripped up the ID cards of the arrested in Bolzaneto, shouting, "here you have no rights, you are no one", expressed the undisguised nature of the state, of which they are the loyal and obedient servants.

The illusion of an end

The courage of the impossible is the light that breaks through the fog, before witch death's terrors fall and the present becomes life.—Carlo Michelstaedter

All that is remembered of the days in Genoa is the brutality of the cops. The joyous aspect of a subversion of daily life has been almost completely buried. But the uprising of three years ago is still there, threatening in its incompleteness. So threatening that in the meantime its meaning has not only been eroded by state reason that has imposed an endless war, but also by slander, mystification and dismissal put into action by all those – in uniform or overalls – who were supposed to guarantee order and security in the streets of Genoa, with the results we know so well. So threatening that hundreds of direct actions against power (from sabotaged ATMs to blocked trains, from attacked police stations to damaged scientific institutes, from burnt diplomatic cars to wrecked Italian branch offices and dealerships) have been carried out in the weeks and months after Genoa throughout the world. So threatening, finally, that after the fog of representation, power is preparing the cement of imprisonment.

A deafening babble

Everyone who has anything to say, come forward and shut up.
—Karl Kraus

The revolt ended, and the commentary on it by journalists, specialists and experts began. And the more the accounts and interpretations of what happened grew, the more its crystalline clarity diminished. The revolt in Genoa in its lived totality has been cut up and dismembered into so many tiny particles. Everything has been ground up and reduced to powder so that nothing can be seen anymore. Naturally this formidable work of mystification has been carried out in the name of truth. The truth that many expect and demand to be pushed through in the halls of the courts.

And yet, everyone knows what really happened. It is indelibly etched in the memories and the flesh of the thousands of demonstrators who were there. And Genoa has precisely demonstrated the absolute practical uselessness and the frequent dangerousness of cameras and video cameras. Apart from the police, who profited from them in identifying and denouncing many rebels – a task made easier by the omnipresence of carriers of telephoto lenses – and the journalists who collected their wages for the work carried out, of what use was all this camerawork? What's the use of showing the entire world that the vice-chief of the *Digos** in Genoa, Alessandro Perugini, kicked a boy who was stretched out on the ground, immobilized by the cop's colleagues, in the face? Has he been put in a position where he can no longer repeat his endeavor, because he was caught in the act? Has a court condemned him; has he been kicked out of the police force and replaced with a well-educated officer, respectful of the constitution? Not at all, quite the opposite. With rather macabre humor, the state named Mr. Perugini as the Italian representative for an international campaign against torture in the world.

The belief that it is sufficient to expose the abuses of power in order to force it to its knees is an ideological illusion, deserving to disappear like all ideologies. Goodness knows they felt wretched, these idealists who believe in the light that vanquishes the shadows, at the news that the experts of the magistrature observing the video established nothing less than that it could have been a stone launched by demonstrator deflecting the bullet that killed Carlo

* Political police

and police infiltrators disguised as Black Bloc. I believe that the documents below help to tear apart this fairy tale.

Perhaps the worst aspect of this "cover-up" of the actual social struggle that broke out in Genoa is that, like the non-analyses that tried to turn every armed attack of the 1970s in Italy into a fascist or secret service provocation, it deflects our attention from the questions that are really significant, the analyses that can be useful in our ongoing revolt against the ruling order.

For example, it would be quite worthwhile to note that the actions that attract participation by supposedly apolitical exploited people are precisely those that attack the structures of capital and the state that they experience in their daily lives: banks, temporary work offices, supermarkets, police stations, etc. Boring marches, unnecessary and ritualized confrontations with cops and the drone of those preaching to the choir do not attract anyone, and with good reason. They don't constitute revolt or even real resistance.

There is also the question of the role of anarchists in such events. As the following texts show, many anarchists in Italy chose not to go to Genoa. Rather than following the dates and places chosen by the masters, they act when and where they choose on their own terms. I agree with them about this. But there are those who argue that the outbreak of real revolt that occurred in Genoa shows that the anarchists all should have been there. I think this is absurd. If an uprising breaks out in one place, is the best practice for every revolutionary to rush to that place to join the uprising there, or to express solidarity by carrying on their own revolt where they are with the possibility of spreading insurgency beyond the limits of one city?

The writings published here include pieces written before the protests, immediately afterwards and later in relation to trials of people facing prosecution for the events of the revolt in Genoa. Some of the texts expose the lies that have been told about those days. Others reveal the nature of such loyal opposition as the *Tute Bianche*. But what I find most interesting in these texts are the analyses of the revolt that went on, the questions about the place of anarchists in such situations and the tying together of the events of July 2001 with earlier rebellions in Genoa and elsewhere. I hope these texts will not only counter some of the lies that have spread about Genoa, but more importantly will further more profound and serious discussion about how anarchists would relate to such events.

Wolfgang Landstreicher

GENOA IS EVERYWHERE

(This statement was issued by some anarchist from Turin, Italy
about a month before the G8 summit in Genoa)

By now, it is a matter of fact. The world is on the verge of being transformed into a single enormous supermarket. From San Francisco to Calcutta, from Rio de Janeiro to Moscow, we will all get in line to consume the same identical products of unnatural, gaudy appearance. That which forms an authentic wealth to safeguard for many – autonomy and difference – could be swept away forever by the imposition of an economic policy and the consequent social system. When we are presented with a single possibility while every alternative is kept from us by force, we cannot speak of freedom of choice in the face of an offer, but only of coerced obedience. When a single model of life to which we are to conform is imposed on us, the continuing production of our days on earth (with all their pleasures, tastes and hues) becomes the totalitarian abyss that many see opening before them. Briefly, NEOLIBERALISM is the name given to the particular economic policy that the Masters of the Earth are applying. GLOBALIZATION is the name given to the process of homogenizing unification that it entails. Over the past several months, hundreds of thousands of people have taken to the streets against neoliberalism and globalization. On the occasion of meetings between the political and economic leaders of the most powerful states (in Seattle, Davos, Washington D.C., Melbourne, Prague, Gothenburg...), protest demonstrations have been organized that have claimed the attention of the entire mass media. The next occasion is to be in Genoa at the end of July, corresponding to the G8 summit. But if, two years ago, this protest movement could close its eyes to certain contradictions within it so as to avoid putting a brake on the initial momentum, it seems to us that reflection on its significance is becoming increasingly urgent and admits no delay.

Neoliberalism supports a kind of *capitalism without frontiers*. The most powerful multinationals (mostly US capital) thus succeed in imposing their interests even when these go against the “national good” of the little states. Intolerable, right? But what are the opponents of neoliberalism fighting against? Logically, the most

pathetically trying to relaunch itself. Those who are so indignant that hundreds of comrades went to Genoa with the intention of inciting a rebellion, making a minimum of preparation in this direction and trying to avoid the trap of direct conflict with the police, should reflect more on who aroused the spirits for months, promising assaults and invasions without having any intention of carrying them out, without giving the least consideration to the possible consequences. They should reflect more on who raised the white hands of non-violence to the skies as a sign of surrender and not of dignity, helping to send thousands of defenseless demonstrators to certain defeat. And perhaps to pose a few more questions: can one be truly “non-violent” and collaborate with the state, the greatest expression of violence? Who could denounce those who smashed shop windows in Genoa? Maybe those who smashed bones, heads and teeth? Maybe those who were indignant about trampled gardens and then consider workplace deaths normal? Or even those who want to invade the “red zone” of privilege from the “grey zone” of collaborationism? If anyone who attacks a bank is an infiltrating provocateur, how might one describe those who advise a government minister, discuss with a member of parliament and make contracts with a police chief? That Friday furnished some answers.

Saturday, July 21, political calculation and fear took the upper hand over rage. The various militant political rackets organized themselves to distance and purge their true enemy: all the uncontrollables who had made their plans fail so miserably. As is well-known, that evening the police, unbridled in their absolute certainty of impunity, carried out the attack on the Diaz school, the temporary office of the Social Forum. Everyone there was brutally beaten by the enraged officers. A seemingly incomprehensible action, because along with the rest, the cops beat some of their best allies who had distinguished themselves in their work as informers the whole time. In reality, this episode fits perfectly into the military logic that governed the operation of the forces of order. The proof of the strength of the Italian government had to be shown once and for all.

The ideology of disobedience^{*} itself would experience its first disobedients. A little more than an hour after their demonstration started, the good intentions of the *Tute Bianche* were shattered. When the leaders of the white overalls again exhorted journalists in their train not to confuse them with the violent after coming across the first shell of a burnt car, when the smoke that rose in the distance was still distant enough that it could be ignored, the charge of the *carabinieri* in via Tolemaide put an end to the simulation. Despite the negotiations beforehand, this time there'd be no spectacle: the cops attacked in earnest! Deaf to the appeals of their petty leaders who called them to give up, to not react, many *Disobbedienti* began to fight against the men in uniform, with the help of other demonstrators who rushed to confront those who were attacking them. For a few hours, there were no longer violent or non-violent, men or women, social democrats or anarchists, militants or common people, building surveyors or unemployed, but only individuals in revolt against the guard dogs of the existent and the life that is imposed. It was during these conflicts that Carlo Giuliani was killed. He was not a "black bloc" person. He was not an anarchist. He was not a provocateur. He was not an infiltrator. He was only a young man who had reacted to state violence. Not one of the few, but one of the many.

Let's be clear on this point. In the days that followed, all the career politicians that infest the movement initially took their distance from what happened, accusing the rebels of being a handful of "provocateurs" and "infiltrators" who had intentionally sabotaged a great peaceful date with their actions, causing a historical occasion for being heard to be lost. The entire pack of social democratic dogs — the same ones who had raised so much dust and noise up to that time and who therefore believed themselves to be the vehicle of history — spilled an ocean of slander on them, reviving the old Stalinist tradition of the "hunt for the plague-spreaders". This was a way of venting their rancor against those who decided to escape their control, revealing their presumed authoritativeness in all its falseness. It was a way of closing one's eyes in the face of the end of their political project, the vainglorious inconsistency of which came out in all its wretchedness at the end of those days,

^{*} This is a reference to the *Ya Basta!/Tute Bianche/Disobbedienti/Social Forum milieu* which negotiates spectacular acts of "disobedience" with the authorities for media consumption.

extreme would have to answer "against capitalism", while the less extreme would have to say, "against capitalism without frontiers". The former, as enemies of a world based on profit—no matter who benefits from it or within what border the exploitation occurs—the latter as enemies of a world based on the profit (of the ruling class) of the richest countries at the expense of the profit (of the ruling class) of the poorer countries. But whoever merely protests against the limitless global expansion of capitalism, against its lack of respect for borders, in substance shows themselves to be in favor of a form of local capitalism, even if ideal controlled from the bottom. Therefore, within the movement *against neoliberalism and globalization* two spirits live together, which for linguistic convenience we have differentiated as the "more extreme"—who want the elimination of capitalism and declare themselves against all governments and their representatives from whom they have nothing to demand—and the "less extreme"—who support or at least end up accepting the necessity of capitalism with a human face, limited and regulated by a democratic government, and whose intention is to explain their reasons to the current rulers. Not a small difference. But then, how and why did they come to find a point of agreement? For convenience, above all. Alliances draw together to gain strength. But it would be foolish to believe that in an alliance the sides in play are all situated on the same level. There is always a stronger side and a weaker side. And naturally, it is the stronger side that dictates the conditions of an alliance, decrees its slogans, determines its movements, derives the greatest advantage from it and—if it is sufficiently able—causes the potential disadvantages to fall on the weaker side. The only thing left to the weaker side, if it wants to do anything, is to conform itself. So then, the alliance of the two spirits present in the movement is determined by the choice of a common enemy: neoliberalism. In the face of the great power of the opposing side, it is said, differences must be set aside for now: "First we stop globalization, then we will see what to do." The condition posed would even be understandable if it were mutually respected. But how do things really stand? Do both the components of this Sacred Alliance stand to benefit from it equally? Are the existing differences expressed in the same manner and do they hold the same possibilities?

What then is the declared enemy of the anti-globalization movement, capitalism as such or neoliberalism? And when we are present there at the summits of the superpowers convinced that we

are "putting pressure" on the Masters of the Earth to which side's needs is it responding? At the various anti-globalization demonstrations, violent clashes with the forces of order have occurred. This is what has forced the mass media to pay more attention to the disputes. Here is the usefulness of the alliance — some of the more extreme will say. In the final analysis, if it hadn't been for the thousands of other less extreme demonstrators whose mere presence served to hinder the maneuvers of the police, these clashes wouldn't had such a favorable outcome for the demonstrators. But the less extreme are also satisfied that there have been clashes. In the final analysis, if the "extremist menace" that needed to be averted had not been there on display, the Masters of the Earth would have had no reason to listen to them. As to those demonstrators who use clashes with the police in order to gain recognition from the Earth's Masters as go-betweens*, it is clear that though they speak out of both sides of their mouth ("we are not violent, but we clash with the police", "we give advice to government officials and sit on municipal councils but we are antagonists"), they belong by right and by deed to the less extreme objectors to neoliberalism since their objectives are the same and they only distinguish themselves from the latter through the means they use to pursue these objectives. Now battling the police is not the primary objective of the more extreme, while being heard by the Earth's Masters is the primary objective of the less extreme. Paradoxically, who has the most reason to exult in the disorders that have happened up to now? In other words, to whom is this strange anti-neoliberalist coalition benefiting the most, the more extreme like the Black Bloc or the less extreme like the *Monde Diplomatique*?

Let's digress for a moment. It is not at all strange that the mass media has rebaptized the movement with the name "the people of Seattle". It is as difficult to find a gram of intelligence in the head of a journalist as to find water in the desert. But we don't understand why this idiotic description is repeated by a large part of the movement itself. It is useless, the American dream even enchants its would-be opponents, those who on the one hand announce their refusal to live "like Americans" and on the other hand accept protesting "like Americans". So if the friends of neoliberalism look to Washington, D.C., its enemies look to Seattle. It matters little,

every act has value in itself, in its absolutely immediate consequences. The city is taken over in the escaping and advancing with the back and forth of the changes, much more than playing in its streets as children or passing there later with a girlfriend. In the hour of revolt one is no longer alone in the city. —Furio Jesi

After the passing of the rebels, who curious people and youth of the neighborhoods would frequently join, nothing was any longer as before. Cars, as mobile boxes that transport workers to their daily condemnation, became toys with which to amuse oneself and barricades with which to stop the police. The siren song of advertising that poisons the spirit and commodifies bodies was silenced. Electronic eyes were blinded. Journalists were driven away. Looting transformed commodities to pay for into free goods to share. Through colorful writing, the walls were freed from their dismal greyness. Streets, docks and buildings were used as arsenals. The city plan, modeled on the needs of the economy and refined by the imperatives of social control, broke down under the fire of the uprising. Quite quickly, the impossible became possible: the prison of Marassi, mostly emptied in order to leave space for eventual arrests, was attacked. The same fate struck a *carabinieri* barracks. For their part, the men in uniform spread all the violence that they could. Those who have accused the black-clad rebels of having provoked the repression would do better to take note that the police and military operations were already planned and organized as a preventative form of deterrence in the face of it all. In fact, it was not the result of an excess of zeal, of too much tension or of inexperience, but was rather the true face of state terrorism that raged unfettered, launching its armored vehicles at breakneck speed against defenseless demonstrators. This is what really determined the generalized spread of revolt. The very thing that was supposed to stop it, the police intervention, ended up feeding it. In the course of a short time, thousands of demonstrators who were peaceful up to then joined the rebels and began to fight against the cops, leaping into a desperate guerrilla battle. Even among the militants of the political rackets whose leaders called for calm, moderation and non-violence, there was much insubordination.

* Most notably, in Italy, the *Tute Bianche*—translator.

The anticipated battlefield was the one that stretched around the "red zone". Here, in front of the gates and fences protecting the summit center, is where assaults of the demonstrators were expected. This is where the petty leaders of the mediated, media protest gathered their troops. This is also where the guard dogs of power were concentrated in order to repel the pressure of the discontented subjects who came to beg for their illusory rights. Everything seemed ready. A multitude of respectful citizens who cry out their reasons, the forces of order hired to repel them, the skirmish agreed to in negotiation in order to evoke and exorcise the specter of conflict, the journalists who hurried there from around the world, the final applause since, in the end, everything had to develop peacefully, summit and counter-summit. None of this came about. From their side, the institutions had no real intention of avoiding conflict, due to their clear desire to teach an unforgettable lesson to the ungrateful consumers of Western well-being. From the side of the movement, or at least one part of it, there were those who preferred to be protagonists of an explicit rebellion against the so-called Masters of the Earth rather than become a spectator or play a walk-on part in an agitated TV series to the profit of the mass media. Thus, the rebels were not seen around the "red zone". They preferred to desert the virtual conflict agreed to by the institutions in order to go and find the real conflict, without mediation. Despite showing up in the city and on the date set by the institutional agenda, several hundred enemies of this world, quite different from one another, without leaders or followers, without head or tail, would go where they weren't expected. Instead of launching themselves headlong against a supposed heart of domination, they preferred to go elsewhere, knowing well that domination has no heart since it is found everywhere. The physical spaces where the cult of money is practiced, where the stink of the commodity lingers in the air, where the lies of commerce are heard — and not the mere "symbols" of capitalism, as the leftist vulgate of the adorners of the existent claimed — would come to know the practical critique of action: banks would be attacked, supermarkets looted, dealerships set on fire.

A city can be beloved, its houses and streets can be recognized in our deepest and dearest memories, but only in the hour of revolt is the city truly experienced as our city: [...] ours, because it is a circumscribed space in which historical time is suspended and

after all it's only a matter of miles, as long as all eyes are tuned to the USA. In spite of the much praised Autonomy.

Autonomy would like every one to be more or less free to choose what, when, how, where and with whom to act. The "people of Seattle", on the other hand, like all People, is afflicted with a political defect. Within it are aspiring mayors, aldermen, councilors, even up to parliamentary whip. Of course, we are referring to those who intend to be elected as legitimate representatives of the "people of Seattle" in order to be invited by the earth's Masters to sit with them at the next negotiating table, after having sat at the police chief's table. At bottom this is all more than understandable. Less understandable is that the others adapt themselves to this ignoble game and allow themselves to be treated as citizens who are requested not to disturb the public peace. For months we have witnessed a painful spectacle. The Masters of the Earth meet in the most varied corners of the world to formalize decisions made elsewhere. Their opponents follow them like puppies in search of attention: they stand on two paws, bark, growl, at times even nip at the edge of the pants of those who rule them.

Now it is quite clear. Though there is nothing to say to the true citizens of "the people of Seattle, we would like to address some observations to the others—to those without fatherland, to the deserter from all citizenship. At Gothenburg, the police fired, wounding a demonstrator who was throwing a rock. The Italian government has already made it known that it is interested in listening to the less violent opponents, provided that the more stubborn are left out of the dialogue. This can only mean one thing: having achieved their first goal—the much sought after institutional recognition—the less extreme opponents will quickly cease to be interested in continuing to march along side the more extreme who were useful up to now, having at first contributed to keeping the tension that created such excellent publicity high, but who will only be an encumbrance to them from now on. As soon as they are admitted into the presence of the earth's Masters, what use will it be to them to continue using certain means? And at that point, what will happen? Those who have participated in this movement stirred by a hatred for capitalism have fought against its guard dogs, smashing shop windows and destroying machines, determined to destroy this world from top to bottom. But who chose the place and time from which to launch this attack? The earth's Masters chose it. They chose the battlefield, they chose the method of conflict. Up to

now, most of the opposition has behaved as the police expected. Now this game is coming to an end. The police are quick and even given permission to shoot in the back. As petty politicians, the leaders in overalls, whether white or red, have every interest in centralizing the movement of opposition to neoliberalism. As subversives, we have interest in expanding rather than "globalizing" the movement of struggle against capitalism. The police are waiting for us in Genoa at the end of July in order to beat us, photograph us, film us, arrest us and maybe shoot us. And instead we could be anywhere at any time. The shop-shutters of McDonald's and the banks of Genoa will be armored during the days of the summit. The world will be at our disposal at any time. And this would only be the beginning since as soon as we leave off following the due dates that others set for us, we will finally be able to choose when, where, how and who to strike.

If we decide for ourselves, we will be unpredictable. We will lose allies, but we will find comrades along the way.

—a few nobodies neither want to represent or be represented by anyone

The thread of a history

What just was will probably soon be forgotten. Only an empty, awful memory hangs in the air. Who was defected? Foul, wretched profiteers. What was young had to fall... but the despicable ones sit there in their comfortable drawing rooms.—Ernst Bloch

The G8 summit in Genoa was the occasion for a huge experiment in control and militarization without precedent in Italy: streets closed and armored with gratings over fifteen feet tall, the complete restructuring of traffic circulation, manhole covers preventatively welded... and more conical provisions were not lacking (underpants and socks removed from the balconies!). Many exasperated citizens left the city, which assumed the grim appearance of an enormous concentration camp. Twenty thousand men from all the armed corps of the state came together in the Ligurian capital in order to patrol it. Roadblocks were set up, body bags in which to put the possible dead ordered, selected snipers positioned on the roofs and frogmen stationed in the water. An authentic torture chamber was prepared for prisoners at Bolzaneto, the management of which was assigned to the gentlemen of the special prison anti-riot squad (the GOM). While the task of maintaining public order was entrusted mainly to the *carabinieri*, which formed the CCIR (*carabinieri* contingent for decisive intervention) for the occasion, constituted of soldiers commanded by officers of the elite *Tuscania* corps, active earlier in Somalia, Bosnia and Albania.

For its part, the state did not prepare to control a protest, but to deal with a war. It's not a matter of controlling demonstrators, but rather of clearing the board of enemies. In Genoa for the first time, the [Italian] state experimented with the military logic that presides over international missions in a systematic, explicit and widespread manner against its own people. In a demonstration of how the line of demarcation between external and internal enemies is disappearing in a world unified by the religion of money. In a demonstration of how power must test out in small scenarios what might be general in the future. After all, if war is considered a police operation, a police operation could well be considered a war.

The outcome showed one of the constants of military and technological expansion: everything that is prepared merely waits to be used.

In defiance of numberless counter-investigations that have ended up complicating what was so very evident through the *totalitarianism of the fragment*; in defiance of the chattering with which the specialists have covered up this uprising and the slander with which the political pack of hounds has besmirched it, we want to retrace a threatening history in order to put it back in play.

Secret appointments

A mysterious appointment exists between the generations that have been and our own.—Walter Benjamin

A few days before the G8, some Genoans went to a carpenter in the historical center of the Ligurian capital with the request that he prepare pieces of wood to be assembled as poles. The old craftsman immediately grasped the intentions of these unusual clients and told them what *they*, those of his generation, used in conflicts with the police. The memory goes back to the revolt of July 1960, to the young people in striped t-shirts, in the working class neighborhoods of Genoa. The old man explained that, in order to face the charges of the riot cops, the insurgents made use of the stockfish left to dry outside of the numerous fish shops of the alleys. The vendors passed them to the rebels, but not before immersing them in the water tank to make them sturdy and effective. The paths of the historical center are no longer the same, so our friends left there with their collapsible poles. But a few days later, these pieces of wood will be a sort of baton between two generations of uncontrollables and rowdies.

Friday, July 20, 2001, after hundreds on rebels have liberated some neighborhoods from the capitalist normality that is the coldest of icy monsters, a supermarket is transformed into a collective, free banquet. For a few hours, rebels and residents of the area freely help themselves, eating and joking and discussing. Even a journalist, paid to serve with his telescopic lens as others serve with their cudgels, is photographed by one of his colleagues as he comes out with two packages of mozzarella.

In order for this mozzarella to meet those stockfish in a "tiger's pounce into the past", a social uprising was needed that could replace historical time with the time of revolt. An uprising that upset both the plans of the Earth's Rulers and their guard dogs and those of the mediated and media opposition.

CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD THE RESUMPTION OF HOSTILITIES

Everything and more has been said about the G8 summit at Genoa.

Accustomed as we are to the deliberate media confusionism, nothing any longer surprises us; not even when it is written in black and white, coming from "authoritative sources", that Osama bin Laden has enlisted armies of European nazi skinheads to kill the American president during the G8 meeting; or that there is a threat hanging over Genoa of aircraft under remote control by terrorists that are ready to indiscriminately bombard the city with cans of AIDS-tainted blood; or even that the CIA is preparing stink-bombs capable of rousing guilt feelings in demonstrators and so on.

It would be enough to make one laugh if one were not weeping.

Of course, immediately afterwards, one hears that the G8 meeting will be animated by exactly the same concerns as the protestors (but how?!), that the latter are doing a referendum to see if Italians are agreeable to seeing their "engagements" with the police, and that, though determined to block the G8, they are also determined in demanding that the state finance and host them in Genoa in order to do so (?!).

Brazen lies appear side by side with horrendous truths, true and false together in an exhibition of the incredible, in an asphyxiating confusionism interested in sanctioning the surrender of any critical good sense that becomes too dangerous as a revolutionary threat in the face of the delirium in which we exist. Reality must be increasingly *incomprehensible* in order to support a survival that is more *unbearable* every day.

The obsessive chattering over the G8 event, and particularly over the so-called "galaxy" of protestors, confirms the triumph of the REVERSAL of reality and representation: it creates a situation in which demonstrators are to conform themselves to their media image, constructing their roles, behaviors and identities on the basis of its dictates.

In this way, the spectacle – with its mechanisms and its ideology of fictitious "participation" – invades the movement of opposition to the consequences of industrial production, removing the possibility of a serious critique and of real conflict. Such invasions, however, come to be quite well accepted by that portion of the protestors who are candidly convinced that they can use *the journalists* (rather than

being used by them) in order to swell their ranks, slaving after the consensus that a great media success would inevitably give them. Here, then, is the so-called "hard wing" of the Social Forum (the dreadful *Tute Bianche*) inflicting a disgraceful pseudo-advertising campaign (to the sound of referendums, feigned conflicts, interviews and services of every sort) upon the already tormented summer TV spectators, a campaign directed at enrapturing the consensus of the citizen-consumer. In this way, it only acts to sanctify the role of passive spectator before a world that is distant and managed by others. But isn't this really the alienation on which current power relationships are based? Isn't this what any force interested in overturning the premises of power would have to fight on the field?

"Protesters" of what then? What does this "anti-globalization movement" call into question?

Certainly not the grey banality of spectacular democracy, that rather, due to a lack of arguments, precisely needs any sham opposition that contributes to artificially maintaining a credibility that has been damaged by the global outbreak of catastrophes and suffering.

Not, so much the less, is the necessity of the market economy called into question. Rather it finds a mouthful of oxygen in seeing its (potential) opponents fighting for capitalism "with a human face" rather than for its abolition.

The bourgeois ideology of progress, the illusion of planetary well-being that is the fruit of the abundance of commodities and is guaranteed by technological and scientific rationalism, has now shown its true self: its results, its disasters, are before everyone's eyes – in our bodies, on our plates... There is certainly no need to list them (if a need is felt for something today, it is certainly not more *information*, or *counter-information* as it may be).

With every innovative function exhausted, nothing remains but the despotic reproduction and administration of a social organization that, *despite everything*, must go forward.

The triumphalism that accompanied the spectacle of mercantile abundance at its dawn is finished, and all that is left is a world that is going to the dogs on all fronts, with a caste of functionaries to govern its agony. They don't tell us that we are in the best of all possible worlds anymore – because that would be ridiculous – but simply that no one else is now capable of running such a battered planet. After having destroyed every form of community and

of the social order and the life as subjects that it imposes. Collaborators or enemies: this is the ultimatum that the state launches at everyone.

This is also the sense in which the continuous propaganda that the various Ministries of Fear are orchestrating around the concept of "terrorism" can be understood. Especially since the attack on the Twin Towers, the demonstrator who breaks windows is equated with the revolutionary who shoots down a man of state, and the latter is equated with the kamikaze who blows up a crowded bus. Thanks to this self-interested confusion, power has tried to hide the meaning of the days in Genoa: on one side, a social uprising that involved thousands of individuals willing to bring down the order of money and truncheons; on the other side, the state that threw off its mask, thus revealing its true assassin's face. For anyone who did not want to draw any lessons from that July, what more could we add that power has not amply shown by beating and killing in the streets and by humiliating and torturing in the enclosure of its barracks? What could we add about the inanity of anyone who asks the courts for Truth and Justice, as if a single truth and justice could exist on both sides of the barricades? Haven't the government, the rulers and the judges been explicit in absolving and promoting the murderers and torturers in uniforms, like always?

In the same way that the machinery of control cuts up neighborhoods and cities with its barriers and check-points, its surveillance cameras and squadrons, the inquisitors cut up events with their inquiries and legal codes. Public ministers Canepa and Canciani – two neo-specialists in the hunt for rebels – are merely refining the work started with the militarization of Genoa and continued through the attacks, the murderous bullet of Alimonda plaza, the raid against Diaz, the tortures in Bolzaneto and other barracks, the arrests and expulsions in the following days and months. In relation to the investigations, public minister Silvio Franz, well-known for covering up state scandals, has carried out a leading role thanks to the aid of a collection of experts notoriously linked to the sphere of the *carabinieri* and of neo-fascists.

It is up to those who have not forgotten that contagious rebellion which conquered the streets, to those who don't want to let the blood shed by the hand of the state's cops dry up in their mind, to furnish all the weapons needed for solidarity toward the demonstrators on trial. This is the meaning of the modest notes that follow.

MAKING THAT JULY TURN OUT TO BE A THREAT

On the trial of the rebels of Genoa

On March 2, 2004, the trial against twenty-five demonstrators accused of "devastation and looting" for the rebellion against the G8 in July 2001 opened in Genoa. And it is just the beginning, a testing ground aimed at perhaps even wider judiciary operations. It is an *exemplary* trial in every sense: for the type of charge (which has very few precedents in Italian history and which anticipates several years in prison), for the way in which power has prepared the terrain for the plays and vendettas of the court, for how the whole business illustrates the obstacles that every collective movement of individual liberation has to face in the courthouses and in the streets.

Anticipated by twenty arrests ordered by the attorney's office of Cosenza in November 2002, and by twenty-three more arranged a little later by the attorney's office in Genoa, this trial wants to send everyone a clear message: the uprising of Genoa will have its scapegoats. It is quite obvious that what is at stake goes beyond the July revolt: itself to project its dire shadow over the future. As an example, one can take the initiative, promoted by the attorney of Genoa, to acquire a space on the Ligurian newspaper *Il Secolo XIX* to publish the photographs – taken by a surveillance camera placed on the street – of two demonstrators with the aim of identifying them. On that occasion, the crime of "psychic participation" made its public appearance again: in substance the state affirms that it is not necessary to directly participate in acts of revolt in order to incur the favors of repression, rather it is enough to be present where they happened without preventing others from carrying them out; in short, without turning into police agents. We add that those arrested in Cosenza were explicitly made an indecent offer with some success, which in consequence would become a constant: the "renunciation of violence" in exchange for release from prison – and we will have an even more precise picture. What is on trial now is not this or that action, this or that act of sabotage, but rather the attitude toward the institutions and, more generally, the refusal itself

sterilized all human relationships, after having expropriated all of our awareness and know-how, after having transformed us into appendages of an infernal and incomprehensible technological apparatus that are incapable of interacting with nature, our own bodies and other individuals of our species, they tell us that all that remains to us at this point is to trust our fate and the fate of the planet to technology (that is, to Capital) to resolve an emergency that we can neither understand nor, much less, confront. This is what is meant by the affirmation that "history is finished", which therefore means nothing more than that we must bow our heads and obey... Otherwise, the truncheon falls.

The signs of crisis accumulate to the point that the spectacle itself cannot to avoid speaking of its own ruin.

From the moment of its triumph, Capital has been able to convert the problems of management into which it fell – originating in crises, in resistance, in contradiction – into points of strength for a further affirmation of its class power. Today, in the face of the impossibility of hiding the gravity of a planetary disaster (ecological, epidemic, of life) that has no precedent, Capital finds the ultimate justification for its domination in the harmfulness that it has itself produced.

Really, the spreading "anxiety", provoked by the prospects of a future governed in a blatantly authoritarian manner through the dictates of a global economy, is taken in tow by Capital and its supporters who, dressed in the costumes of ecologists and humanitarians, promote themselves as the only ones holding the means for confronting the impending catastrophe.

Time and time again, the general crisis of existence is passed off as crises of particular sectors, disconnected from the totality of industrial production and its basic contradictions. The unavoidable consequences of a mode of production that is structurally polluting, poisonous and productive of imbalances are made to pass for temporary incidents caused by poor management that therefore demand corrective interventions by the state. It is needless to say that, since such "adjustments" are themselves the harbingers of new harm, they will render further technological-bureaucratic "remedies" necessary in their turn... and this becomes a business called "reconstruction", "regulation", "conversion", "reclamation". Not being able to produce anything good, capitalism reproduces by living off its trash (the material as well as the ideological trash) and

TUTE BIANCHE: Firefighters Extinguishing Revolt

The *Tute Bianche* are already well-known in protest movements throughout the world. They are easily recognized with their white uniforms and armor, always in the front line at demonstrations. Although they have frequently demonstrated their reformist and reactionary spirit, in our opinion, they still haven't received the response that they deserve. This is why we consider it necessary to spread information about them, their tactics and their lies.

The *Tute Bianche*/Y'a Bastat! movement originated in the most famous, sold-out social centers of northern Italy, like Leoncavallo in Milan, Rivolta in Mestre, and Pedro in Padua. By carefully observing these places, we can understand how the *Tute Bianche* could only be reformist: ongoing agreements with the authorities, active collaboration with political parties, huge events described as "do-it-yourself", well-defined leaders and hierarchies. In their declarations and actions, they play at being the tough guys. More and more, they are seeking new support among those who struggle against globalization. But the reality can't be hidden: their relationship with green and leftist parties (many Communist Youth, members of the Rifondazione Communist Party, are active in the *Tute Bianche*) and their direct involvement in politics (some of their leaders, such as Farina and Casarini, have taken part more than once as candidates in elections over the last few years, and these are the same ones who pompously declare war on the police and the G8 on TV, while "negotiating the demonstration" with Foreign Minister Ruggiero and police chief DiGennaro...). Can we consider politicians to be on our side of the barricades? We don't think so, not even when they wear the balaclava in order to seem tougher or talk of struggle against power merely to gain our complicity. In our opinion, the *Tute Bianche* degrade the conflict, mediate in order to reach a situation of compromise and consider political parties and institutions as reference points. The *Tute Bianche* are a sedative that social war does not need. We do not think that one can or should hold out a hand to the enemy. If the *Tute Bianche* do so (and they do), then they are our enemies. They are firefighters extinguishing revolt. Revolt doesn't need water; it needs gasoline to feed its fires.

The Overalls have taken over the term "Seattle protest", speaking of it endlessly. But we have seen them in action many times. This tells us that the spectacle continues this way:

JUNE 30, 1960

JULY 20, 2001

... AND TODAY?

On June 30, 1960, Genoa rose up against the national congress of fascists of the MSI with a revolt that escaped the controlling hands of leftist organizers.

"A large portion of the national press judged the events of July as a revolutionary attempt by teddy-boys and exasperated masses." Certain "men of the left" picked up this opinion, concerned not to have the responsibility for these events attributed to them, since the campaign was portrayed as if it had been an attempted communist *comp d'état*.

"What happened in July was not a 'revolutionary event'.

It was a defense action that developed this time on a class plane. In Genoa, the young people and workers intended to defend themselves with their own means and methods. This time, they did not delegate their struggle to anyone. They applauded political leaders who spoke of struggle, but at the same time they did not wait for orders from above (that would never come). They established a real, profound unity in action. And in the end, they drew a lesson from the actions they carried out.

"We hear talk about teddy-boys and exasperated masses. But this too is a self-interested judgment. The kids of Genoa who set fire to the riot cops' jeep are young people who know what they are doing. They are workers and students who have developed a deep contempt towards the power that weighs on every moment of their young lives. The events of July are the first class manifestations of the new generation that grew up in the post-war climate. The ruling class has not spared resources in order to keep young people entangled in the system, but the events of July have shown that the young people refuse this system.

"When events take place in the streets, the bourgeoisie and opportunists always speak of 'exasperated masses'. The bourgeoisie do it for obvious reasons: the opportunists do it to simplify the problem and to show that without their enlightened guidance nothing gets resolved. But if the

Beyond the charges against individual comrades, beyond their positions, beyond what they can do on the defensive level, it is the meaning of the direct action that broke out in those days that speaks out loud and clear: the generalized attack against the structures of capitalism (banks, multinational offices, dealerships, temp agencies), the clashes with the uniformed murderers, the end of all negotiated protest.

After what they filled our ears with for days, in paid seminars, about the massacres perpetrated by multinationals, do we really lack arguments for responding to the many self-styled "nonviolent" activists, when in the mass media, they condemn the action of those who attack these same multinationals? 1+1 still makes 2, even if all the state's thinkers say the opposite, even if "disobedient" politics achieves more and more Orwellian falsification... Isn't it, in fact, Orwellian to march against the concentration camps for undocumented immigrants together with those who built them (the DS*) as happened on November 30? Someone, who could still put 1 and 1 together, smashed the windows of the DS office in the night. A small gesture, but clear, and furthermore, quite far from a mass situation (that is to say, none of that old refrain about the "irresponsible gestures" with repressive consequences that fall on everyone). Clarity, precisely... As their only response, the *Disobbedienti* and the Turin Social Forum expressed their full solidarity with... the DS, before proposing that the municipal administration should paint the concentration camp yellow to make it more "humane".

Only by destroying all complicity with these despicable firefighters against all revolt will we be able to rebuild the meaning of our autonomy and the totality of the conflict in action. Only in this way will the time of the dance and the stones come back.

Rovereto, Italy, December 5, 2002

* The Democratic Left party that first instituted the "Centers of Temporary Residence" for undocumented immigrants.

Scene one: they declare war, filling their mouths with big words and claiming to be able to close down or impede this or that meeting in turn. Scene two: they request authorized demonstrations and collaborate with police and with political parties that often participate in their protests. Scene three: they present themselves at demonstrations armored from head to toe, in helmets and other protection; they put themselves in the front line where they monitor, with their imposing passwords, so that nobody gets the ill-omened idea of doing anything different (especially of directly striking the places of capital); and the march proceeds "without problems". Part four: this is where they seek their revolutionary credibility, in clashes with the police. Usually they clash at the end of the demonstration with plastic shields and helmets, trying to break through the police line in order to enter the prohibited zone. Farce clashes! They last a few minutes with the maximum attention of the television stations that are present. Then the *Tute Bianche* later complain of the "unbelievable" police attacks. It is well-known that the police never use tear gas in these situations, though it is their favorite weapon in other sorts of clashes.

But the *Tute Bianche* construct a public consensus through this farce. Their intention seems to be to win over more and more potentially enraged people, who are ready to attack power, and drag them into passive non-activity or, in any case, a mere spectacle. Another important aspect is their role as police in white. The *Tute Bianche* have frequently tried to isolate, unmask or physically attack anyone who has taken action violating their rules. In May 2000, during Tebio, the *Tute Bianche* distributed a kind of 12 commandments, a list of rules to follow. For example, (#2) "No one can carry out spontaneous actions of any sort", or "Nothing that the organizers did not decide can be launched". And if someone forgets the rules, there is a fine invitation to snitch (#12): "inform the *Tute Bianche* of anything that happens". In that situation, there were some who violated these rules, directly attacking some symbols of capital. A few days later, the white ones decided to visit the social center that had hosted the "dissidents", threatening those present for ruining their little spectacle. The examples abound. In Ancona, March 2000, the white ones made a cordon between anarchists and police. In Bologna a few months later, at an anti-fascist demonstration, they preferred the usual clash-farce to actually

* A big biotechnology fair that took place in Genoa.

attacking the fascists. Have you ever wondered why the *Tute Bianche* are so very well-known and appreciated by many politicians and by the press? We hear this question discussed quite a bit in Italy. Their appearance leads you to believe that they are a revolutionary movement, but they actually tend to transform protests into institutional compromises, into spectacles for the press, reducing everything to the search for "social peace". Day after day, they are killing the feeling of spontaneous revolt. It has become clear to us that the white ones are a dangerous infiltration into the protest movement and also a real obstacle to any total struggle against the power of capitalism. It is time for comrades to reflect on this, so as not to make the mistake of collaborating with them. The time has come for us to free ourselves of them! Knowing that they are already trying to monopolize the protest against the G8 in Genoa and preparing their spectacle, will you participate with them or try to ruin their party?

*Some (Italian) rebels
(July 7, 2001)*

1+1=2 On the G8, Arrests and Solidarity

*To everything there is a season
and a time for every purpose under heaven*

A time to build up

A time to break down

...

A time to dance

A time to mourn

A time to gather stones

A time to cast them away

—Ecclesiastes

After dismissing the case of the murder of Carlo Giuliani, the state imprisons eight G8 protesters, subjects about twenty more to restrictive measures (house arrest or obligations to sign in), organizes searches throughout Italy and issues notifications of investigation on charges of devastation, arson, resistance, etc. Is the only voice left on the conflicts of July 20 and 21, 2001 that of the cops and judges?

It is not enough to remember the brutal repression, the beatings, the torture and their deliberate planning.

In expressing solidarity with arrested comrades, against another repressive move, first of all the meaning of those days is affirmed.

What happened in Genoa was a split between protest negotiated with the government and the police and real opposition that is beyond any institutional mediation, a split between those who demand state funding, seek media representation and make alliances with parties and unions and those who instead make self-organization the aim and the means of their activity.

Many have tried to repair that split, with the most ambiguous positions and the most shameless opportunism. Now more than ever it is necessary to be clear. If the repression is to be attacked without quarter, independently of the individuals or groups on which it falls, it is necessary to affirm one's own perspectives.

* At the police station

moment in which the murderous bullet struck him (wouldn't it have been sufficient to arrest and beat him democratically in the barracks?), was offered to them.

But the only thing truly surprising remains our surprise in the face of all this. Is it necessary to remind ourselves of the other occasions in which we have had means for knowing them in their deepest essence?

SOME OF OUR REFLECTIONS ON THE DAYS IN GENOA

The heated commentaries about the events (above all, obviously, those coming from the institutional press) report the accusations from the heads of the organizations present in Genoa that speak, almost unanimously, of provocateurs in conspiracy with the police (thoroughly filmed and photographed), or, in a minority of cases, of hooligans let loose to take action who, nonetheless, played games with the police giving them the opportunity to attack the bulk of the peaceful demonstration.

The first observation that one can make is that these accusations have been methodically repeated for 25 years every time a street demonstration escapes the control of its presumed political organizers. To hear these people, there are always hot heads, comrades that blunder, people that 'fall for provocations' (from fascists or police), or, in the most scandalous cases, infiltrators.

This is the only justification of those who try to manage and use the determination of thousands of people to protest in matters that touch on everyone in direct and indirect ways.

There are thousands of reasons for protesting: a meeting of powers, the most powerful in the West, protected by thousands of men, fully armed, the same men who in the first place, everyday, everywhere, apply the decisions of the powerful.

The G8 is nothing. Nothing is decided there. But it is a symbol. And there were those who wanted to protest symbolically against it. With different ways and limits.

And at this point it is necessary to understand its limits.

To contest democratically (in the accepted meaning of the so-called organizers and exponents of civil society, this means without offending, without doing damage, without defending oneself) also means to understand—as those same powers have rightly remarked through their spokespeople—that these powers represent nations in which democracy reigns, that they have been democratically elected and that they therefore represent all those that, by voting and accepting the terms of democratic management, accept being governed by this or that political alignment.

It is a system that doesn't leave gray areas: one accepts it or not.

In this sense, those who thought of protesting democratically were practically demonstrating only the disappointment of an

institutional minority about the decisions of the government that they themselves legitimized by voting.

We understand: even if there were a million people, they would have been democratically considered a minority. The voters have decided otherwise, they have voted for others, and those elected democratically decide for everyone. Several millions of people have elected these powers. The others continue to try. Scratch, scratch, maybe one day it will be your turn to command.

What is the use of a demonstration of a minority? To let off steam, to show that we do not agree, to try to put pressure on our governors to make more just decisions... maybe because we should do it. But when we find ourselves in the streets again for the second, the third, the hundredth time, after years of bearing limitations, oppressions, injustices, repression, violence, that are imposed by decisions from on high, something else happens. We remember the anger we feel when we suffer wrongs, how it is impossible to manage one's own life because in each of its aspects we are limited and repressed by a system that has fabricated predefined platforms from which it is impossible to escape. We understand how it may not even be possible to know who is responsible for that which befalls us.

Our employers are not responsible—if it wasn't for them we wouldn't eat; it's not those who make us pay taxes (now they take them directly out of the paycheck, that way it is less painful); it is not the one who fines us, in the end he's only doing his job; it isn't the one who teaches us how to behave from the time we're children—we must have common customs—and afterwards if there are those who don't do these things, patience and endurance; it is not those who govern us, in the end they merely act as an expression of the majority of us; it is not the one who beats and arrests us—someone has to do it—and then it is not by force that those "below" make themselves heard.

In this way, when we understand that in everyday life things don't work, no one is ever at fault, no one is responsible, they all have a justification, and it is not possible to do anything other than beg, vote and ask for a few more crumbs (for some more money, a little house...)

No one is responsible for the great collective problems: pollution, hunger, disease, war and so on. We never find those who are responsible. And we are left there to wring our hands, powerless.

There is the one who has come down to the street with these feelings long since rationalized, who has felt them emerge during

whitewashers of our house, or of a bit more in there, have said and done is perfectly fitting with what they are. And we have learned to recognize this quite well over the years, from times when they didn't use certain disguises, but others that fooled even us, when, due to our naivety and superficiality, we managed to conceive of them as distant comrades in struggle. We were diverted by a language that we heard, undoubtedly – I repeat – due to our stupidity, as less offensive than what, to our surprise, it would become. Its calls for autonomy and class struggle perhaps appeared ironic to us, even though we had not understood that the direction of that irony was diametrically opposed to what we would have hoped. Now the jokes have become clearer, their political capacities have been refined (still at a level of extreme cultural impoverishment, but we should not forget that the entire political scenario has suffered a fierce intellectual abasement, along with all *society* that plods along in its magnificent informational ignorance), their names have appeared unequivocally flanking those of the class enemies. And yet, even in all this, an *oppositional* component plays a role, hauled out as an artifice at the most opportune moments, or instead held back, as a provocation by a neo-vanguard outside prime time, or a residue of adrenaline rising again as when – youth, at bottom, when all of us feel a bit like anarchists... – they played at conflicts with the police, a practice that still continues to rouse a certain sympathy. Of course, we recall that in those days they didn't use harnesses and the turtle formations (but did they really do this or was it just a folkloric invention of journalists? We ask it here again) and amenities of this kind, but the agreements with the political police were already a recurring and noted practice in the streets.

Now, why are we surprised when their spokespersons disassociate themselves from the violence of the black bloc at first, in order to later recant and express rage for the repression that shot someone to death?

Why not believe that they would take advantage of this situation? A comrade is dead, killed by a *carabinieri*. A comrade put his life at risk, while the vultures wretchedly begged the repression not to strike their procession of honest and correct *disobbedienti*, but that it be applied elsewhere, to those who don't respect the rules. As soon as this happened, hypocritical and convenient indignation, expressing the shortest memory in the world, explodes flaring from the eyes of the corpulent leader of the white-washers when he gets wind of the occasion that a *martyr*, who was still an enemy until the

meaningful and important, something of our own. Unfortunately, this is not always so. However, we declared ourselves outside of that context on the assumption, which we continue to hold well grounded, that it was much too narrow there. This assumption is strengthened by some experiences that have involved us directly, that disappointed us.

And yet here we are, surprised once again. For two very different reasons, which have aroused very different reactions in us, though both still surprise us.

First of all, the comrades in Genoa, their vitality, their capacities, even their numbers. To be clear, and in consideration of the fact that we also know of these events primarily through the journalistic filter, we are referring to the so-called *black bloc*. We are amazed, at bottom, that comrades could find such ample space for action in a context that we knew was dominated by the double control exercised on the territory, by the police on the one hand and by the forces of organized opposition on the other, both our enemies (and in the case of the "anti-globalizers", we refer to those "responsible", to the promoters, the various "general headquarters", the functions of order, certainly not to the individual demonstrators, among whom we believe there were many, dressed in their preferred color whatever that may have been, who did not necessarily consider themselves to be represented by those who were the self-proclaimed leaders of the good spirit of the protest and thence in the right – having to cleanse the procession of unwelcome presences.)

But fortunately, anarchists are often bad prophets. We are amazed and immediately loved these comrades, even if perplexity still persists within us, the distance not so much from the method, but rather from the various interests, the perspectives that diverge, but that in *any case* don't keep us from considering them our comrades. The thing that no one says is that in Genoa class conflict manifested itself, that it expressed itself in this form as well: the attack of the exploited against the structures of capital and against the cops who defend it. All the embodiments of exploitation disgust us in earnest, not symbolically, not *democratically*. The social war is not our invention.

The second reason for our surprise: the reactions of the *Tute Bianche*. It is useless to widen the discussion, that the Genoa Social Forum in its totality expressing itself as it did is absolutely a consequence of its very nature and reason for being. In reality – and this is why we are surprised at our surprise – even that which these

the hours in the street. And so many have vented their anger, have exploded, understanding how, in these demonstrations, we have nothing else to do that doesn't lead to a mere picnic. So many have destructively expressed their own anger and fury against a system which is, indeed, a black block, a block that doesn't leave space for any other method, least of all that of the self-determination of one's own life. Every imprisoned being eventually rebels, no matter how large and comfortable her cage may be.

Then we can also say that the police would have charged people regardless, that they did charge those who did nothing, that they waited for nothing else, that they like to beat, that, in any case, the atmosphere was that of intimidation, but the fact is that there was no other sensible way to behave when faced with eight powers that decide for everyone and that surround us with thousands of armed men.

And anyone who has seen the endemic violence of the institutional demonstration, of its hlocks, of walls, of divisions, even before the direct violence, knows that the responsibility is that of the State and of its protectors, rather than provocateurs. Their very existence is a provocation, a threat.

When we protest against those who govern the world, we cannot use measured means. The system wants someone (or some people) to govern everyone, and the individual can do nothing. And in these days, thousands of individuals, certainly not only some anarchists (now that everything interests us except riding the tiger), have expressed and lived their own anger without mediations.

They know—the organizers, the mediators, the institutional politicians—that no one, neither us, nor them, nor anyone in the streets yesterday or in the future, can govern protest, can restrain the fury of those who are constrained every day to live under the aegis of the State, of laws, of justice. They—the so-called pacifists, social democrats and reformists—cannot do anything but retrace the systems and methods of those that they say they are contesting: hierarchical and specialist organizations, delegation, representation, control, censure, repression. Power against power. They disappear. Or they resign themselves to organizing trips for bored alternative-antagonistic tourists, to exotic and distant destinations that thus don't touch them closely in their daily lives.

Some general and abstract critical notes: the danger of these demonstrations is that even the most determined and sincere subside when they can only express themselves on these occasions, when

there are mass situations, when the satisfaction of taking action is shared by many, and when these actions are disseminated by the media: the dangers therefore are the renunciation of projectuality and self-satisfaction.

On the other hand, that which is materially extremely dangerous is the spreading of film, video and photographic cameras everywhere, even in "our own" ranks. The instrument most used by repression for control is the identification and repression of individuals. It is necessary to eliminate this practice, this stupid and useless habit of filming and photographing among ourselves first of all. Representation, the spectacle of reality, cannot do anything but lead our actions astray.

El Paso Ocupado, Sunday, July 22, 2001

VULTURES

Text taken from "Tephra" – subversive Newspaper – #2 – Trieste, August 2001

In the end, we still fall, a bit stupidly every time.

And yet we know them well, these annoying vultures. By now, we should no longer nurture even the least bit of hope in finding courage, dignity, coherence or the capacity to put themselves on the line in their words or actions within them. In short, they are not comrades; our dreams are much too distant from their aims. But even less are they worthy adversaries, people who have clearly chosen which side to take, without dreary games with which to try to win over anyone who is still capable of feeling emotion, of getting angry, of looking without so many ideological filters at the horrendous and omnivorous reality that surrounds us all. When such an individual finds the force of the desire to *do something* in herself, in the search for comrades, perhaps he runs into them, into the *Tute Bianche*, into the social centers of the Northeast [of Italy], into the *Ya Basta* association, into Leoncavallo, into any other of the myriads of protean monograms with which these people try to disguise themselves and to ensnare agreement.

But not us, we, who, no matter what, still love to describe ourselves as anarchists – and tremble with rage when journalists take the liberty of making distinctions in this as well, debating over who really is and who is not one – we don't consider ourselves so naïve, and we look with detachment at the "people of Seattle", which gets so much exposure that it seems to us to be the mechanism of a struggle and a method (that still has interested and even roused enthusiasm in us) that offers the flank so widely to instrumental manipulation, to repressive attack, but especially to media banalization and the most dreary spectacularization, and therefore to its substantial surrender to the inoffensive game of parties. We have chosen not to be part of that "people", the journalistic christening of which merely nauseates us; we refuse to make ourselves fit into the mold of any group or sub-group, even running the risk – and not just because of this choice, for goodness sake – of enclosing ourselves in a fortress, the ideologically pure connotations of which might be capable of preserving us not only from sullying our hands and consciences too much, but also from our own frustrations and lacks. We declared ourselves to be outside under the pretext of being inside of something else, much more

And here?

According to journalists and *carabinieri*, on Sunday, July 22, in Rovereto, unknown people smashed the windows of a temporary work agency and a TIM store, sabotaged various ATMs and destroyed some surveillance cameras. On Tuesday, July 24, in Trento, various entities linked to the Genoa Social Forum organized a "human chain" (with bandages over the mouth as a protest), followed by some testimonials and reflections on the events of Genoa. Although they denounced police brutality, many of the speakers expressed their respect for the forces of order. Anarchists and libertarians from Rovereto and Trento distributed flyers with a completely different content. Later, much to the concern of the organizers, who had promised police officials to guarantee a peaceful initiative, anarchists and libertarians went off on an autonomous and unauthorized march. About sixty people united behind the banners "Murderers" and "The state is Terrorist". After a *colorful* tour through the streets of Trento, an assembly was proposed in the nearby sociology faculty. Due to the high level of participation, the following day the discussion hall was transformed into a permanent assembly against repression. The assembly continued for the entire week. It was not connected to parties, unions and institutional associations. Now it meets every Wednesday. On Friday the 27th, an unauthorized festival of mobile interventions, with a small display and a "performance" about the repression, involved passersby for more than an hour. Money was collected for the legal expenses of those arrested in Genoa. On Saturday, a group of playful rioters closed a Benneton store with a shipyard net. A sign ("Red Zone"), a banner, interventions and flyers linked the beatings in Genoa to multinationals, emphasizing the fact that, in the world of money, the "G8" is everywhere every day. But Saturday evening, in the sphere of "Venetian Rovereto", some anarchists, dressed in more or less medieval costumes, read a proclamation against "coppers and bravos", in solidarity with who, being "weary of chatter and tyranny, attack the symbols of power in their rage against the lords and dynasties". Many walls found a bit of their public use again, thanks to the writings.

Against this world of which the commodity and power are the heart, against Carlo's murderer, "this is only the start, the struggle continues", as was said in another, happier time.

Where are the accomplices?

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE INFORMATION

The Black Bloc Doesn't Exist

An eye-witness account:

As I said, I was there. Not everywhere, obviously, and not at every moment. But I saw several things, spoke with many people that I knew and knew very many people with whom I spoke.

First a few quick things: there were tens of thousands of people who set fires, looted, vandalized and destroyed, not just anarchists, not just people from the social centers, not just organized people, both Italians and foreigners (I can say Greek, Spanish, English and German – but the French people that I saw were all peaceful). And there were many more that sympathized with them, among them a whole lot of Genoans. Opposing them were the police, the monitors from the *Tute Bianche* to a small extent (not always identifiable without the overalls themselves), those from the Rifondazione [Communist Party] to a somewhat greater extent. Friday at Manin Square, the pacifists politely asked the Black Bloc not to operate there since "that was a peaceful square", and the Black Bloc willingly cooperated. I said that was bullshit, and the Italian and English participants in the Black Bloc agreed with me, but since the square was full of babies, old people, kids, etc. – they decided to leave anyway. The police charged into that crowd, and for Manin Square and the poor pacifists, it was the start of a hard time. The Black Bloc participants, having generally practiced such things, vanished in a flash. This is the point: it is not that the police did not attack them, but that they did not allow themselves to be attacked. They moved quickly in small groups, picking up clubs, stones and long pipes along the way and putting in every effort to disengage, they avoided the police and raised barricades behind them. They were not the only ones. Generally, all the numberless vandals in Genoa aimed to liberate a space from the police and change it in accordance with their desires, canceling out some of the hateful signs of this society that we know so well: banks, financial institutions, public offices, chain stores, police stations, car dealerships, etc. (it is said with sorrow that the churches did not merit attention). These changes were perhaps a bit poor and repetitive. This is something we will need to reflect upon and refine.

In every case, vandals kept far away from the police and were rarely captured. The conflicts of Friday, in which Alimondo square, between Tommasco square and via Tlemaide, was the epicenter,

were quite different. The huge numbers of police, the containment installations and the wretched geographic arrangement had frustrated the aims of the *Tue Bianche*. In this instance, their retreat brought thousands of people into contact with the police, leading to close conflicts and all that followed from this.

In short, it is quite true that the police mainly harassed pacifists, the defenseless or actual passersby. But this is what always happens, and it is perfectly logical. It is easier, more convenient and less risky to thrash those who are available and don't defend themselves, rather than those who respond (there were many counter-charges, some of them forceful) or have already taken off.

The case of the nocturnal attack on the school is also different. Here, the aim was clearly to strike at the coming together of "good" and "bad". Structurally, this was a weak point that the government was interested in shattering in order to create an opposition between those who had acted in tacitful harmony in the streets (not absolute harmony: there was the cretin who would throw anyone who brought a helmet or a bandana out of the march, and the one who threatened window breakers, but these were isolated incidents), and wear out the movement (because a movement was created and took action in Genoa) in an internal opposition that allowed the spokespeople to be co-opted into the political rot, replacing the voice of refractories with their media caricature, maintaining that violence is objectively of the police. The infiltrators, which the television shows and who were certainly there, served the same end, dressed as demonstrators (and not as Black Bloc, a comparison to which I take offense: there is a difference comparable to that between the Foreign Legion and the EZLN). Such infiltrators have been around for at least thirty years. So think about it: what is the function of infiltrators? Certainly not to provoke violence and counter-violence, since real comrades are quite sufficient for such an end (what revolutionary does not act where and how she can to destroy existing things?). Rather infiltrators act to spread mutual suspicion, particularly toward the most violent and the most radical protesters (two concepts that overlap, but do not coincide). They act to spread the idea that violence makes it easy for power, and that therefore the violent are serving power (however unconsciously), and the nonviolent are the ones that power really fears, and, therefore (still more), only capable and prepared leaders can lead you to distinguish what is good for you from what is bad for you. The infiltrators of today are useful to the Agnolettos and the

fund, obviously managed by the state, would resolve the fates of the world's poor and make the stock market collapse) and other huge piles of bullshit. Only an idiotic government like this one could refuse dialogue with such opponents, respectful of the law and authority. It will change ideas or it will change positions. One doesn't just govern with the police and with journalistic lies.

One can fight this world, which makes individuals more and more dependent on the world market and a suffocating technological-bureaucratic machine, only by arming its ultimate enemy: *autonomy*. But can those who want to be divided into managers and order-takers, those who demand financing from the state, those who merely want to manage the same productive apparatus differently, be autonomous? As we have seen, those who accept all of this sooner or later ask for aid from the police.

And yet something...

...escaped passivity and the leaders' control. The G8 was only smoke in the eyes, a farce of political and police arrogance to cover up decisions that were made elsewhere. And yet, in opposition to that symbol, men and women, often strangers to the fossilization of militancy, found the thin thread of a critique. On the one hand, the destruction of banks, the superb assault on the Marassi prison and the clashes are seeking their reasons and their perspective. On the other hand, some space for autonomous dialogue has been opened, certainly facilitated by this government's bullshit. The recuperators of the left are feverishly at work. Any good signs come from the other side, those who fan the flames of revolt and freedom. If nothing else, those who feel nostalgic for "revolutionary" vanguardism, enlisting for every anti-institutional protest, have vanished or been beaten. We should recall that the fundamental difference is not the one – as convenient as it is bogus – between "violent" and "nonviolent", but rather that between those who want to conquer or manage power and those who want to destroy it.

Discussions and actions are following pretty much everywhere, in and outside Italy. While a debate that escapes the crafty politicians takes place in an isolated village, a couple hundred miles away someone burns a police station (as occurred recently in Berlin) or sabotages a biotechnology institute (as occurred in Milan). The poetry of insurgent life is finding its words.

NOTES ON GENOA FROM ADESSO #8 (August 2001)

The face of the police...

...in Genoa was the same face as always. Unfortunately for those who invoke the state of law and speak of the violated constitution. Police and *carabinieri* have always been faithful in defending the ruling classes, in controlling, repressing and, if necessary, killing. The charges were premeditated and scientific. In Gothenburg, there was no right-wing government, but the murderers in uniform were the same. Of course, what was seen in Genoa hasn't happened in years, both in terms of its brutality (in the streets, the barracks, the prisons) and its extent (thousands of demonstrators beaten bloody, hundreds arrested, eighty even disappeared). But there also hasn't been a conflict of this sort seen in years. What seems new, with regard to the forces of order is the unanimous chorus – from the DS* to the *Tute Bianche*, from the *Manifesto*# to the “zapatista” radio – of those who rebuked them merely for not having been selective in the repression.

The “movement” of Genoa...

... was mainly composed of men and women organized by others with reformist and “respectable” positions. The contents that the various spokespersons expressed were so reasonable and realistic that they constituted a complete parody of any authentic opposition. Furthermore, a counter-summit (the Genoa Social Forum), financed by the government and commended by the entire democratic press, says a great deal about these “disobedient ones”. In such a circus, which extends from the parties to the unions, from Lilliput to the *Tute Bianche*, from Catholic associationism to legalized social centers, there is not a single real critique of capitalism.

In the face of an environmental and social disaster that is more extensive every day, this opposition that is so happy to place itself in the spotlight, proposes a democratically elected UN (so that we can have fine, democratic wars), citizens' control over... multinationals (at a time when these citizens don't even control what they think or eat), a tax on financial transactions (surely such a

* Italian Left Democratic party.

Left-wing newspaper

Casarinis, just as those of yesterday were of use to the Capannas and the Sofris: by showing that in the embrace between disguised police and stupid insurrectionalists, only submission, mediation and “politics” could give direction to an existence lacking in meaning and pleasure, since they can be the meaning and pleasure of those who are rather annoyed with the existent, but not to the point of first of all critiquing their own individual existence.

[...]

For some time now, the Black Bloc has been a media subject adapted to any use, that can justify almost anything, especially those things that the powerful don't give a shit about justifying.

But, in reality, the Black Bloc is a large number of likeable and sensible individual comrades who want to destroy this world at its foundations and have, therefore, already begun to demolish some of its pieces. Anyone who was in Genoa and didn't have shops and ideologies to defend and claim can only attest to their respect, friendliness and kindness. It is now necessary that more and more people draw inspiration from their methods and practice, with the aim of enriching it, so that it can be considered and communicated better and give form to the first steps of positive activity in the liberated spaces that this sort of action can create.

TO HAVE DONE WITH THE ORDER OF THE MANY AND THE DISORDER OF THE FEW

or IT WASN'T THE BLACK BLOC WHO TURNED GENOA UPSIDE DOWN

There were about four hundred. No, there were at least a thousand. Not on your life, there were many more, let's say, two or three thousand. But they made such a huge mess, there must have been at least five thousand. And it's all their fault. Due to a few bad apples, the fine basket of civil disobedience has been spoiled.

It was their fault, the Black Bloc's. The black overalls. They and they alone destroyed Genoa. What are they? They are anarchists. Or rather, no, they are insurrectionalist anarchists. But also a few squatters. And hooligans. And crusty punks. And agent provocateurs. And secret service infiltrators. And friends of the carabinieri...

But do we want to put an end to the lies and idiocy?

A brief terminological preface. "Few" means "of limited quantity, a small amount". With generalized value, this term is often used as a replacement for "small", "brief", "insufficient" and "inadequate". Euphemistically, it can also mean "almost no one". But "many" is directly opposed to "few" and indicates "a notable amount" or an "elevated degree", or it can even mean something akin to "great".

Well then, every form of domination has defined manifestations of hostility against it as a phenomenon involving only a few.

As a social organization that claims to be eternal, the state has its obvious reasons for spreading and imposing the idea that its origin is not historically determined, but is an inescapable natural phenomenon – in short, not open to question – everywhere. One lives under the rule of the state just as one lives under the light of the sun.

This is why anyone who fights against it must be crazy, mad, demented. Needless to add that in the world of the state, normality is the rule followed by the many. It follows from this that madness must be the exception of the few. The dominant discourse thus presents every transgression of its code as a small, brief, insufficient, inadequate event that is carried out by a few, by almost

FORWARD, COMRADES!

The historical moment is serious; social war paws the ground and the class enemy pursues. Let's avoid the snares of hierarchy, bureaucratization and the specialization of roles, but without abandoning ourselves to the irrelevance of a concept of rebellion without strategy. Because the revolutionary perspective must know how to overcome the cage of spectacular rot imposed by power, in order to impose widespread conflict everywhere in daily life where reification smother's life. And more than ever before, this conflict needs to undertake voyages of autonomous organization and of the reappropriation of the historical awareness that has been denied to us, in a war without quarter against separation and authority.

FOR THE ABOLITION OF CLASSES AND THE STATE.
FOR LIBERTARIAN COMMUNISM.
LONG LIVE SOCIAL REVOLUTION!!!

Revolutionary committee of public health

THE END OF ILLUSIONS

A specter returns to roam through Europe. After endless years of a social peace composed of exploitation, alienation, misery and suffering, the rage of the oppressed returns at last to the streets to serve the death sentence to a social organization incompatible with humankind and the planet. On July 20 and 21, in Genoa, the contestation against the G8 has suddenly led to a practical critique of capitalism and the state for tens of thousands of demonstrators. The stubborn and generalized conflicts with the forces of order, the devastation and the burning of so many banks and of a few police stations, the attack on the prison of Marassi, the looting of supermarkets, spontaneous explosions of conflict never soothed.

The determination with which the insurgents of Genoa confronted the police forces, going beyond the narrow limits of civil disobedience and democratic protest, unmasked in actions the directed illusions with which the political rackets have sought to disengage all possible radicality and autonomy. The claim that what was a moment of mass resistance was a degeneration provoked by a few "professionals" of disorder who came from who knows where and were infiltrated or actually directed by the cops seems ridiculous and disgusting. The rebellion of Genoa made the political maneuvers of all those who tried to use them appear ridiculous. This is why they compete with the police in slandering it and calling for repression.

As always, in the face of the radicalization of the conflict and the breaking of consensus, the ruling class and its state react in the only possible way: with violence. The murder of Carlo Giuliani, the butchery and torture perpetrated in Genoa are yet a further demonstration of how useless it is to take the trouble of demanding rights and democratic guarantees that the state calmly gets rid of as soon as they are no longer sufficient for guaranteeing order and disguising class exploitation. The game gets harsh... The democratic and reformist illusions collapse miserably. The insurgents of the will to live don't mourn for them.

Capitalist society only knows how to produce misery, isolation, ecological disaster, epidemics, war, hunger, suffering.

BUT A NEW WORLD IS TAKING SHAPE ON THE ASHES OF THE ECONOMY.

no one. Who would want to rebel against the light of the sun? Only a few lunatics would do so.

And yet all history is made up of the revolts in which the many and not the few have taken part. These revolts against the world of money show that everything is possible, even the impossible. To neutralize and remove this significance, the ruling order has always made use of a stratagem that is as simple as it is effective: attributing the activity of the many to the few, circumscribing and placing limits on the expressions of dissent. This is an objective that is easy to achieve, especially now, when the omnipresent chatter of the mass media is not limited to reporting the event that happened, but forms it and tailors it to the needs of those who hold power. In the face of any protest movement, especially when it expresses itself in an anti-institutional manner like in Genoa, the media must do nothing but select a component in it, choose it as the representative of the movement as such, speak of it endlessly, linger on its most folkloric and spectacular aspects, and then the entire social movement will take on the traits of that one component.

Endless examples could be made, but we will limit ourselves to the best known and most recent. The movement that broke out in France in May 1968 was presented as a "student protest". After starting in the universities, this movement quickly spread throughout the rest of society, reaching its peak with the participation of more than eleven million people in the general wildcat strike. The greatest revolutionary endeavor to happen in a Western democracy in the post-war period is thus banalized and historicized as a youth protest movement. The armed uprising that burst out in Italy in the 1970s is passed off as the work of a few "combatant organizations". A vast and many-sided social movement, which expressed its assault on the heavens through thousands of actions carried out daily, has thus been redimensioned as its single most sensational form. The combatant organizations, which were only a tiny part of the movement, have been transformed into the entire movement. This reductive mechanism was also applied more recently, as in the Los Angeles rebellion of 1992 — remembered for it "racial nature" — or the Albanian insurrection of 1997 — where and entire population in arms was depicted as "a few armed gangs". Here in Italy, the most recent example is probably that of the disorders that broke out in Turin in March and April 1998, following the arrest of three anarchists and the suicide of one of them in prison. At the time, the "squatters"

were the ones that the newspapers pointed to as public danger number one, even though those who described themselves as squatters were distinguished by their efforts to calm things down and prevent disorder, doing all they could to throw water on the fire whenever possible, so as to safeguard their beautiful life.

In Genoa, when the air was not yet thick with tear gas, the protest was represented by the icon of the "*Tute Bionche*". Later, when the climate heated up, it was the turn of the Black Bloc, the insurrectionary anarchists, even the "*tute ner*" (ah, the fancies of journalists!). This proved to be paradoxical for several reasons. First of all, because it led to the end of the European left's infatuation with the Black Bloc.

After riding their reputation from the media resonance of the Seattle events, the Black Bloc is now brutally attacked for having done roughly the same thing in Genoa that they did in Seattle. But European left radical-chic, in double-breasted jackets or white overalls, loves those who wear ski-masks, carry guns or devastate banks only when they are far, very far, away, possibly an ocean away.

Otherwise, it's simply a question of bastards, provocateurs, infiltrators.

More or less what the American left said and wrote about the Black Bloc after the events of Seattle. Who knows if the *Tute Bionche* are still willing now to affirm the stirring words of their old communiqué: "We refuse to save ourselves at the expense of the Black Bloc; we recognize their legitimacy in the movement and refuse the logic of 'good' and 'bad'."

Then the insurrectionalists. Indeed, the insurrectionalists are the perfect ones to burden with this part. On the one hand, they are openly in favor of destruction; on the other hand, everyone, from the forces of order to the rest of the "movement", points at them accusingly. What more could be asked? Too bad that there weren't very many insurrectionary anarchists present in Genoa, since they had declared several times that they are against following the dates imposed by the enemy and participating in its initiatives. And for insurrectionary anarchists, the enemy wasn't only the one enclosed behind the red line, but also many of those who wanted to break through it.

But then, to whom do you attribute all this violence? This is the concern that torments you, isn't it? You politicians, journalists, leftist recuperators, you are truly disgusting. The conflicts of Genoa

involved the participation of thousands of people. We're sorry to inform you that no, it wasn't all insurrectionary anarchists. No, it wasn't all the Black Bloc. No, it wasn't all foreigners. It is useless for you to go searching in every dark remote corner for what is right there before your eyes. The most serious event to occur in Genoa, the murder of a demonstrator by the *carabinieri*, should suggest something to you. Despite the hateful attempts of journalists to bring it back under a comfortable, pre-established label, Carlo Giuliani was not "dressed in black". He was not an insurrectionary anarchist. He was not a squatter. He was not a crusty punk. He was merely a young man enraged against this world who was killed by someone defending it. He wasn't one of the few. He was one of the many. Rebellion is not a rare genetic defect. Rebellion is in the air, ready to manifest itself everywhere and in everyone.

Anyone who gets indignant over the devastation of banks and financial offices – which are really the offices of some of the fiercest criminals that exist – is only someone who is deserving of this world, and it is clear that such a one intends to defend it with any means necessary. Casarini, who lost a golden opportunity for displaying his already well-tested show of simulated conflict, and Agnoletto, who has so often stolen his place in the spotlight, have both done their best to defend it, not being averse to snitching or requesting harder and more decisive action from the forces of order. Too bad for them that these forces did it in an indiscriminate manner. These two pieces of shit were forced to expose themselves and admit that they could not control or represent and entire protest movement.

Your certainties are finished, along with your political calculations. The insurgents of Genoa were few in comparison to the peaceful demonstrators, it's true, but they were many, far too many, with respect to your hopes. It is useless for you to go on screaming against "a few rowdies". It is useless for you to go on searching for lightning rods to protect you from the storm when it overwhelms you.

Some anarchists
July 23, 2001